



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 8
999 18TH STREET - SUITE 500
DENVER, CO 80202-2466

Ref: 8EPR-EP

MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 10, 1999

FROM: Wes Wilson, 8EPR-EP

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Wes Wilson", written over the printed name.

TO: Pearl Young, OFA

SUBJECT: Close out tracking on AFS-Colorado, Draft Supplemental EIS, Arapahoe-Roosevelt National Forest, Lakewood Raw Water Pipeline for Continued Operation, Maintenance, Reconstruction,

Region 8 did not comment on this draft supplemental EIS. This was due to the Forest Service on January 11, 1999. EPA Region 8 did not comment because I incorrectly believed this project was one of four previous similar projects from the Arapahoe-Roosevelt National Forest regarding renewing special use permits for community water supply facilities. By the time I realized this mistake, it was too late to comment. Further, the environmental issues are not so significant as to warrant any further action on the part of EPA.

Please close out this project in your tracking system with the notation: "EPA did not comment on the Draft Supplemental EIS." Therefore there will not be a summary paragraph.

cc: Cindy Cody, 8EPR-EP



Printed on Recycled Paper

ERP DATA FORM EPA REGION VIII NEPA REVIEW

{If you have any questions, please contact Virginia Rose, EPA Region VIII @ 303 312-6942}

3/17/99 51

SECTION I - GENERAL INFORMATION

CEQ FILING NUMBER:

980251

TITLE: LAKEWOOD RAW WATER PIPELINE, O & M REPLACEMENT,
ROOSEVELT NF

DATE DUE:

8/3/98

SECTION IV - REVIEW COMPLETION ENTRY

COMPLETE ERP NUMBER:

D-AFS-J65256-CO

DATE OF COMMENT LETTER OR NO
COMMENT MEMO:

EIS RATING:

REVIEWER:

WILSON

SUMMARY
PARAGRAPH:

COMMENT LETTER:
NO REVIEW DONE

309 COMMENT LETTER REVIEW FORM

1. ERP No. D-AFS-565256-C0 2. Region 8 3. Rating of this EIS NR
 4. CEQ No. 980251 5. Letter Date No letter 6. Previous EIS Rating _____

(If a No Comment Form was used, skip to item 13 and circle NC)

(no comment)

7. _____ What is the letter's major environmental issue? (A)ir, (C)umulative Impacts, (D)rinking Water, (E)ndangered Species (G)roundwater, Terrestrial (H)abitat, Environmental (J)ustice, A(L)ternatives, Conta(M)inated Sediment, (N)oise, (P)esticides, Water (Q)uality, (R)adiation, Purpo(S)e and Need, (T)oxics, Aq(U)atic Resources, Historic Preser(V)ation, (W)etlands, Ha(Z)ardous Waste, and (O)ther
 Other is _____
8. _____ What was the letter's second environmental issue, if applicable? (From above list)
9. _____ What was the letter's third environmental issue, if applicable? (From above list)
10. _____ What was the letter's fourth environmental issue, if applicable? (From above list)
11. Yes No Did the letter refer to any interagency meetings or other contact?
 (e.g., Scoping meetings, project meeting, follow up meetings or letters)
12. Yes H L Does assigned rating match the letter's language and content?
 (H means a higher ratings seems justified, L means a lower ratings seems justified)
13. G A P NC Overall, is the letter clear and constructive? Good, Acceptable, Poor (i.e., Are EPA's environmental issues with the project impacts explicitly stated, is the letter clear on what must be done to make the project acceptable and are our requests reasonable?) (NC circled only when a No Comment Form was used)